REMARKS

In response to the non-final office action of November 23, 2004, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-83 are now pending, of which claims 1, 17, 30, 76, 77, 80 and 81 are independent. In this amendment, independent claims 1, 17 and 30 have been amended, and claims 43-83 have been added. New claims 43-45, 54-56 and 65-67 find support at least in the specification at page 20, lines 24-30. New claims 46, 47, 57, 58, 68 and 69 find support at least in the specification at FIG. 8. New claims claim 48-50, 59-61 and 70-72 find support at least in the specification at page 20, lines 18-24 and page 6, lines 10-24. New claims claim 51, 62 and 73 find support at least in the specification at page 8, lines 10-15. New claims claim 52, 53, 63, 64, 74 and 75 find support at least in the specification at page 22, lines 25-27. New claim 83 finds support at least in original claim 9. Applicant asserts that no new matter has been added.

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Revak for the courtesies extended to applicant's representative during the personal interview conducted on February 22, 2005. As reflected by the Interview Summary (see copy of PTOL-413 form attached to this amendment), the Examiner and applicant's representative discussed claims 1 and 2 in comparison with the applied prior art.

Amendment to Specification

In response to the Examiner's objection, the specification has been amended. Applicant asserts that the amended specification is now in conformance with MPEP 608.01(b) and requests reconsideration and withdraw of the objection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 6-9, 22-24 and 35-37 would be allowable if written in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. See Office action of November 23, 2004 at page 7, lines 5-7. In response, claims 6 and 7 have been rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims as independent claims 76 and 77. New claims 78 and 79 depend from rewritten claim 77 and correspond to original claims 8 and 9, respectively. Claims 35 and 36 have been rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and

Applicant : Robert G. Watkins et al.
Serial No. : 09/851,121
Filed : May 9, 2001
Page : 19 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-071002 /
Security 04-CON

any intervening claims as independent claims 80 and 81. New claims 82 and 83 depend from rewritten claim 81, and new claim 82 corresponds to original claim 37. Accordingly, applicant asks for allowance of new claims 76-83.

Rejection under Section 102

Claims 1-5, 10, 14-21, 25, 29-34, 38 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Colvin (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,471). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Colvin does not describe or suggest locating a memory segment within a client communication system that stores client software used for communicating with a host communication system.

Amended claim 1 recites a method for identifying unauthorized client software seeking to communicate with a host communication system. The method includes, *inter alia*, locating a memory segment within a client communication system that stores client software used <u>for communicating with a host communication system.</u>[1] The method also includes determining whether the client software stored in the memory segment located corresponds to client software for an official client communication system, and identifying the client communication system as an unauthorized client communication system when the client software stored in the memory segment located does not correspond to the client software for an official client communication system.

Colvin discloses a registration process that is used to provide a password. <u>See</u> Colvin at col. 2, line 63-65. The registration process may occur programmatically through communication between the software manufacturer's computer and the user's computer. <u>See</u> Colvin at col. 2, lines 44-49. The password must be entered "upon first use of the software." <u>See</u> Colvin at col. 2, line 23-25. As such, Colvin discloses securing software by associating a password with authorized software and requiring entry of the password to use the software. Hence, Colvin does not describe or suggest securing client software used for communicating with a host system.

Accordingly, Colvin does not describe or suggest locating a memory segment within a client communication system that stores client software used for communicating with a host

---

[1] The underlined portion was changed in this amendment, and, naturally, was not addressed by the Office action.

Applicant : Robert G. Watkins et al.   Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-071002 /
Serial No. : 09/851,121   Security 04-CON
Filed : May 9, 2001
Page : 20 of 21

communication system, determining whether the client software stored in the memory segment located corresponds to client software for an official client communication system, or identifying the client communication system as an unauthorized client communication system when the client software stored in the memory segment located does not correspond to the client software for an official client communication system, as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-5, 10, 14-16, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1.

Similarly to independent claim 1, independent claims 17 and 30 each recite locating a memory segment within a client communication system that stores client software used for communicating with a host communication system. Accordingly, for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 30 along with their respective dependent claims 18-21, 25, 29, 31-34, 38 and 42.

Rejection under Section 103

Claims 11-13, 26-28 and 39-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Colvin in view of Houser (U.S. Patent No. 5,606,609). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-13, 26-28 and 39-41 because Houser does not remedy the failure of Colvin to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 17 and 30 from which claims 11-13, 26-28 and 39-41.

Houser discloses techniques for verifying the integrity of an electronic document. See Houser at Abstract. In particular, Houser describes using a has value calculator to calculate a hash value of an electronic document for use in determining the integrity of an electronic document. See Houser at col. 4, lines 19-34. The shortcomings of Houser are believed to be readily apparent with respect to locating a memory segment within a client communication system that stores client software used for communicating with a host communication system, as recited in the independent claims 1, 17 and 30 from which claims 11-13, 26-28 and 39-41.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection of amended independent claims 1, 17 and 30 and the dependency of 11-13, 26-28 and 39-41, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11-13, 26-28 and 39-41.

Applicant : Robert G. Watkins et al.
Serial No. : 09/851,121
Filed : May 9, 2001
Page : 21 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-071002 /
Security 04-CON

Newly Added Claims 43-75

Each of claims 43-75 depend from independent claim 1, 17 or 30 respectively. At least for the reason of that dependency and the reason noted above with respect to amended independent claims 1, 17 and 30, applicant submits that claims 43-75 are allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of $2850 for excess claim fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 23, 2005

Barbara A Benoit
Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40255896.doc